



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Applicant: Achintya K. Bhowmik, et al. §
Serial No.: 10/814,402 §
Filed: March 31, 2004 §
For: Single Crystal Electro-Optic Film on §
Silicon Imager §
Art Unit: 2873 §
Examiner: Jessica T. Stultz §
Atty Docket: ITL.1099US §
(P18549) §
Assignee: Intel Corporation §

Mail Stop **Appeal Brief-Patents**
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

REPLY BRIEF

In response to the new points raised by the Examiner in the Examiner's Answer, the following Reply Brief is submitted.

The Answer makes the following points that the applicant agrees with:

1. The only image that is displayed is displayed on a display means (not shown) that is part of the signal processing unit. See Answer at page 9, last two lines.
2. Claim 1 requires "displaying an image using a second order non-linear electro-optic effect" -- namely, the claim requires that the display use the claimed effect. Answer at page 9, last paragraph.

The following additional points are indisputable:

1. The single processing unit is only described as "a computer or the like." See column 16, lines 30-40.

Date of Deposit: August 20, 2007
I hereby certify under 37 CFR 1.8(a) that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as **first class mail** with sufficient postage on the date indicated above and is addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.
Cynthia L. Hayden
Cynthia L. Hayden

2. The record includes no evidence that "a computer or the like" uses a second order non-linear electro-optic effect.

3. It is irrelevant whether a second order electro-optic effect is used to develop a signal that is then displayed using a computer because the claims include the following limitations:

Claim 1: "displaying an image using a second order non-linear electro-optic effect."

Claim 12: "an imager comprising a second order non-linear electro-optic effect."

Claim 20: "said imager including a second order non-linear electro-optic effect film."

Therefore, the rejection should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 20, 2007



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 S. Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation